

FINAL REPORT

WASTE PROGRAM REDESIGN

Plan Review Implementation Workgroup

June, 2005

WORKGROUP MEMBERSHIP

Pat Chabot

Sue Fisher

Brian Kalvelage

Dennis Mack

Sandy Miller

Gene Mitchell

Len Polczinski

Summary

The Plan Review Implementation Workgroup was established on March 4, 2005 to develop recommendations to the Waste Management Team regarding implementation of the concepts described in the Waste Program Redesign Report related to plan review. An organizational meeting for workgroup leaders was held on March 15, 2005. The first meeting of the Plan Review Implementation Workgroup was held on March 31, 2005 and a second meeting was held on April 14, 2005. The result of the discussions held at those meetings is this first rough draft report.

The workgroup was given 6 charges:

- To determine the specific, limited staff who will conduct specific solid waste facility plan review in the program;
- To determine the staff who will complete the hazardous waste plan review and re-licensing;
- To determine how other work that is plan review and not included in the specific work listed above, is completed;
- To develop a transition plan to assign staff
- To define how the plan review/relicensing work will be conducted amongst all the staff and managers involved (experts, precedent setting and unusual issues guidance, etc.);
- Seek input from stakeholders in this effort

All of these charges are addressed in this report, as well as related issues that the workgroup felt were relevant to their recommendations. The workgroup did not attempt to name the specific staff that would conduct plan review as indicated in the charge, but we have provided recommendations for the process in which those staff will be reassigned. This is in accordance with instructions received at the March 15, 2005 workgroup leader's organizational meeting.

The workgroup initially established the goal to maintain existing staff at their current locations, and reporting to their current supervisors. The group considered the staff with the primary responsibility for conducting plan review (Regional Waste Engineers and Hydrogeologists) as the staff that would implement the plan review changes (ie be assigned to either the Active Landfill Plan Review Group or the Closed/Non-Landfill Plan Review Group) . This is consistent with the Redesign Report. The workgroup reviewed the PDs of the Regional Engineers and Regional Hydrogeologists. Within each group the PDs were very similar. This is probably due to the development of standardized Regional Engineer and Hydrogeologist PDs during the DNR Reorganization of 1996. Based on our review of the PDs, we determined that only minor changes were needed to the percent of time dedicated to each major activity within the PD, but that the major activities in the PD did not change (see the Position Description Section of the report for more discussion).

Based upon this evaluation of the PDs, the Plan Review Implementation Workgroup recommends that the PDs of plan review staff be modified as recommended and that staff be

reassigned to one of the 2 Groups established. In order to carry out the reassignment, the workgroup recommends that staff be solicited for their preferences regarding their future role and work assignments in the Waste Management Program. Based on the criteria described in the report (see Considerations for Selecting Engineers and Hydros for the Groups Section of the report for more discussion) as well as considering staff preferences, the Waste Management Team would approve the membership of each Group. To assist the Waste Management Team in establishing the Group membership, we recommend that a sub team be established to make recommendations. Len Polczinski, Dennis Mack and Gene Mitchell would be good choices for the sub team based on their involvement with this workgroup and their familiarity with this report's recommendations. A representative from the Bureau of Human Resources may also want to be involved in the sub team process.

Job Duty Adjustments

Based on the decisions made in Redesign, the job duties of Hydrogeologists and Engineers need to be slightly adjusted. The chart below provides the job duties of four groups of Engineers and Hydrogeologists. With the following exceptions, the job duties of Waste Management Specialists would not change as a result of the Redesign Process: 1.) WMSs would no longer work on those facilities specified below under the Active Landfill Group (we have provided for a 1 year maximum transition period for the phase out of WMS at active landfills – see Transition Plan section for more discussion). Waste Management Specialists currently work on many of the items listed in the Closed and Non-Lf Group column, including plan review for some non landfill facilities, and this would not be affected by the Redesign.

Revised Duties for Engineers and Hydrogeologists

Active Lf Group	Closed & Non-Lf Group	HW Plan Reviewers	Plan Review Experts
Plan Review, Inspections, Complaint Response and Enforcement for:	Plan Review, Inspections, Complaint Response and Enforcement for:	Plan Review for:	Assist. To Regions:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active Landfills • Closed Lfs Adjacent to Active Lfs • MSW Combustors • Incinerators • Intermediate C&D LFs • Ben Use related to active landfills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed Landfills • Small Demo Facs. • Non-Lf SW Facs • Ben. Use / Low Hazard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HW Re Licensing Plan Reviews • HW Plan Mod Reviews • SW Closed Landfills • SW Small Demo Facs. • Non-Lf SW Facs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan Review Tracking • Workload Balancing • Rev. of Drafts for Siting Related & Precedent Setting Plan Review

		Ben. Use / Low Hazard	
Related Policy	Green Tier/Beyond Compl.	Closures	Plan Rev. Expertise
Tech. Assistance	Tech. Assist. To RR on LFG		Related Training
Coord. w/ Other Prgrms	Contaminant Assessments		Mentoring
	Related Policy		Related Policy Devel.
	Tech. Assistance		Tech. Assistance
	Coord. w/ Other Prgrms		

In accordance with the recommendations of the Redesign Report, the workgroup has removed the WMS role from active landfills (see transition plan section for phase out discussion). We believe that the redesign team made this recommendation to increase efficiency by having fewer staff involved with individual landfills. This has worked well in 3 of the Regions, but members of the workgroup expressed serious reservations about the workload shift in Regions where the WMS has remained involved with landfills. This was one of the major reasons for recommending a transition plan. We also believe that WMS staff currently doing work at landfills can be effectively utilized by reassigning Recycling, Hazardous Waste and Green Tier related work, where we have had continual difficulty in meeting commitments in the past.. It is important to emphasize that WMS staff are critical to our program, and this reassignment in no way reduces their importance to the functioning of our program. The Workgroup recommends that the WMS duties for inspections and complaints for the HW TSDs and the Closed/ Non-Landfill Group remain the same.

The Plan Review Implementation Workgroup recommends that the SW plan review experts provide their assigned functions for both the Active LF Group and the Closed/Non-LF Group. It was clear to the workgroup that this function was necessary for the Closed/Non LF Group to function efficiently across Regional lines and provide the same consistency functions as are provided to the Active LF Group. The Group also recommends that a HW expert be assigned to provide analogous functions for the HW plan review staff.

Although the table above implies a separate HW plan review group, the workgroup intends that the 2 HW plan review staff are a part of the Closed/Non LF Group and may also be assigned solid waste plan review projects. This recognizes a relatively light HW plan review workload (at least until the next round of re-licensing begins in ~ 5 years) and utilizes their plan review skills for SW reviews.

Considerations for Selecting Engineers and Hydros for the Groups

Active Landfill Group

Engineers and Hydrogeologists selected for the Active Landfill Group should possess relevant landfill plan review experience and a successful track record in terms of quality and quantity of plan review work completed. They should possess strong communication skills and be able to successfully handle the controversy often associated with landfill siting. These staff should also be interested in performing this work and be distributed amongst the 5 Regions.

Closed and Non-Landfill Group

Staff selected for this group should ideally be familiar with closed landfills, non-landfill solid waste facilities, small construction and demolition waste landfills, and beneficial waste/low hazard reviews. These staff should also be interested in working on non-traditional regulatory approaches such as Green Tier or other “beyond compliance” activities and streamlining initiatives.

Hazardous Waste Plan Reviewers

Staff assigned to perform hazardous waste plan review should possess relevant experience and a successful track record in terms of quality and quantity of plan review work completed. The selected staff should be interested in performing this work and currently be assigned to appropriate geographic locations. (Note: the staff assigned to HW plan review will also be members of the Closed and Non-Landfill Group.)

Solid Waste Plan Review Experts

The staff chosen as plan review experts should have significant landfill plan review experience and demonstrated ability to provide assistance and mentoring to less-experienced staff. They should possess excellent organizational and communication skills and be interested in providing this service to Regional hydrogeologists, engineers, and managers.

Transition Plan

After Engineers and Hydrogeologists are assigned to each of the Groups by the WaMT, Regional Supervisors will make project assignments for the relevant solid and hazardous waste facilities. Factors will include geographic location of staff, current assignments, workload, and the particular demands of specific projects. The relevant Section Chiefs and Plan Review Experts will provide significant input to this process, with the Plan Review Experts making written recommendations on final assignments to the Regional Supervisors.

On the designated effective date of the Redesign (currently August, 2005), facilities would shift to the new assignees. However, any plan review submittals in-house on that date would remain the responsibility of the previous assignee. In addition, landfills that are in a construction process may remain with the original engineer until the process is substantially completed. These situations will be decided on a case-by-case basis amongst the original staff, the newly assigned staff, the plan review expert, and the Regional Supervisors. However, in no case would we anticipate that the transition period would last more than 6 months.

The Plan Review Implementation Workgroup recommends that the effective date for switching to the Active LF and Closed/Non-LF Groups be postponed until both the plan review staff and the experts can be designated. We believe that switching the plan review staff without having the experts in place and involved with workload distribution would be counter-productive to a smooth transition. The workgroup recommends that the Section Chiefs be in place before the plan review experts are designated.

The Waste Management Specialists that are currently assigned to active landfills will be reassigned to other facilities and duties. However, to make the transition less abrupt, and shift the workload more gradually, we recommend that up to a 1 year transition period be established to implement this change. We anticipate that the plan review staff would take over the inspection and complaint functions currently done by WMS staff for the larger landfills first, gradually working down to the smaller sites. The specific transitions will vary by staff, therefore it will be up to the Regional Supervisor to set individual schedules.

Staffing Levels

The brief evaluation of staffing needs performed by the Plan Review Implementation Group indicated that there was insufficient data to verify that the numbers specified in the Final Waste Management Program Redesign Report were the appropriate staffing numbers. However, because of insufficient data and the lack of time to gather more accurate data, we were also unable to clearly support a different staffing level. Therefore, we have used the staffing levels suggested in the redesign report, with a few minor exceptions explained below. These were:

Active Landfill Group:	8-9 (see discussion below) engineers and 8 hydrogeologists.
Closed and Non-Lf Group:	2-3 engineers and 3 hydrogeologists
HW Plan Reviewers:	2 undesignated positions
SW Plan Review Experts:	1 engineer and 1 hydrogeologist
HW Plan Review Expert	1 Undesignated position

There are 3 Regional Engineering positions that are less than an FTE (2 at 75% and 1 at 50%). The Plan Review Implementation Group believed strongly that these positions should be considered equally with the FTE positions when reassigning staff to a specific Group. We have allowed for this by providing a ranged staffing level for the engineers for both Groups. For

example, the 8-9 FTE staffing level listed above could be filled by 8 persons who are full FTEs, 6 persons who are full FTE and the 3 partial FTEs or in any combination that falls in the 8-9 FTE range.

The Plan Review Implementation Workgroup is recommending that a HW Expert be designated that would operate in a way analogous to the SW plan review experts, coordinating the HW plan review efforts. Because the workload associated with HW plan review is a small fraction of the workload associated with solid waste plan review, we anticipate that this job function would be a small part of an FTE workload.

The appropriate staffing level was a contentious issue within the plan review implementation group. There was a strong minority belief that the staffing level for the Active Landfill Group (8 engineers/8 hydrogeologists) would be insufficient and should be maintained at a minimum of 9 + 9. Even some members of the majority were sympathetic to this belief, but because of the difficulty of providing clear data supporting this level, the decision was made to use the staffing levels listed above. However, because of this concern, the Plan Review Implementation Group recommends that we allow the ability to make temporary assignments between the groups (see the Project Assignment Section for more discussion) when the workload of the appropriate group is such that temporary assignments within the group are not practical. In addition, we recommend that the workload of both groups be closely monitored over the next two years by the SW Plan Review Experts. The experts should draft a semi-annual report of the workload and distribution for a two-year period. This report should be available to both staff and managers. Permanent adjustments between the 2 groups should be considered as appropriate.

Because of funding constraints and program priorities, it is unlikely that additional resources beyond those identified above could be devoted to solid/hazardous waste plan review and associated activities. Therefore, should these staffing levels prove inadequate, additional streamlining of these regulatory programs may be necessary.

Geographic Location

The Plan Review Implementation Workgroup strongly believes that staff involved with the plan review reassignment process remain in their current work locations and continue to report to their current supervisors. This will cause less disruption of the program overall, and help ensure that staff that are assigned to do plan review will maintain many of their current landfill assignments, therefore providing greater continuity to the regulated industry.

For the Active Landfill Group, the Plan Review Implementation Workgroup recommends that our goal should be to have representation throughout the state for both hydrogeologists and engineers. This may not be possible in all cases since other criteria will also be considered when making assignments, but where possible, a statewide spread is desired.

For the Hazardous Waste Plan Reviewers, the Plan Review Implementation Workgroup recommends that at least one of the positions be located in Southeast Region, and the second position be located in WCR or SCR.

In an ideal situation, the Plan Review Implementation Workgroup believes that the SW and HW Expert positions would be located in the Central Office. This provides easier coordination between the individual experts and between the experts and the policy making functions of the Bureau Sections. However, we also believe that skilled and competent staff capable of carrying out these positions exist in the Regions as well as Central Office and that an expert position could function from a Regional location. However, it is the recommendation of this workgroup that supervision of the expert positions comes from the Central Office.

Project Assignments

The Plan Review Implementation Workgroup recommends that staff maintain a core group of assigned landfills. Where possible, the core group of assignments should include landfills that the staff are currently assigned to. This will help minimize the disruption of reassigning landfills. Core assignments may cross Regional lines (e.g. a plan reviewer located in WCR may be assigned a landfill in NOR). This will allow the workload to be distributed as evenly as possible across the state. Staff ability and expertise should also be considered in making the core assignments.

The plan review workload is expected to be variable on an individual basis. There may be situations in which the workload for an individual temporarily exceeds his/her ability to complete the reviews within the required time frames. In those cases, temporary reassignments will be made for submittals (not landfills) in order to alleviate temporary workload increases (see discussion of staff/expert/supervisor interactions for a description of this process).

The Plan Review Implementation Workgroup recognizes that there may be workload situations in which temporary assignments within the same Group are not practical due to all members of the group having a full workload. In these cases we are recommending that temporary assignments may be made between the 2 groups under these circumstances. Before the Regional Supervisor makes a temporary reassignment under these circumstances, the appropriate plan review expert must be consulted. If temporary assignments under this scenario are common, permanent reassignment changes between the Groups should be considered to better reflect the appropriate workload.

The Plan Review Implementation Workgroup recommends that the 18 TSD facilities be split between the 2 assigned hazardous waste plan reviewers as follows:

- 10 SER facilities to the reviewer located in SER
- 8 non-SER facilities to the reviewer located in SCR or WCR

Because staff assignments (permanent and temporary) can occur across Regional lines, there are many logistical issues that we expect will arise. For instance, we will need to develop a policy for handling files and maintaining file access that is reasonably efficient. We will also need to develop contingencies in FIST and other computerized programs that will recognize and respond to individual staff working in more than one Region.

Interaction between Staff, Solid Waste Plan Review Experts and Supervisors

In general, the role of the staff is to complete assigned plan reviews to assure compliance with applicable standards, within specified time frames. The role of the experts is to help maintain program consistency through draft oversight, recommending actions on precedent setting proposals, and staff training; and help coordinate the temporary reassignment of projects. The role of the supervisors is to be the final decision maker, assure accountability, take personnel actions as necessary, and make project assignments. The following statements will help guide the interactions of these roles:

- Staff report to their assigned supervisor
- Supervisors are responsible for staff productivity and accountability
- Staff coordinate with the appropriate engineer or hydrogeologist expert for technical assistance, potentially precedent setting actions, review of draft approvals for siting and continued filling related submittals, and identification of training opportunities
- Regional supervisors work with staff and experts to reach consensus on decisions. Where consensus is not reached, the Regional supervisor makes the decision. The current dispute resolution process (with the addition of a formal recommendation from the appropriate staff expert) will continue to be used, if necessary.
- Experts will monitor plan review workload statewide and work with Regional supervisors if they believe that temporary reassignments are necessary. All reassignments are made by supervisors. Experts may also make recommendations on assignments for new facilities.
- When staff work on a landfill (either temporary or core assignment) outside of their work unit boundary (the entire region is considered the work unit), then they will report to the supervisor in the Region where the site is located for the purpose of making decisions regarding the site.
- Regional supervisors must coordinate with each other for staff who work across regional boundaries for the purpose of setting staff priorities, evaluating work and conducting performance evaluations. Experts shall make recommendations regarding staff priorities and performance as necessary.
- Experts will identify appropriate training opportunities, including mentoring. Supervisors make the final decision on staff participation. Experts will also coordinate internal technical meetings for staff on a recurring basis as workloads and budgets permit.
- Staff are expected to inform the appropriate Regional Waste Supervisor and Plan Review Expert as soon as possible of any precedent-setting or controversial plan review projects or associated issues. If draft approvals or verbal contacts indicate conflicts between the central office and a region, the Regional Waste Team Supervisor, appropriate Plan Review Expert, staff and Section Chief would attempt to resolve the issue or issues amongst themselves. Should this fail, the issue(s) would be raised to our respective immediate supervisors. The final decision would not be issued until the conflict is resolved within the Department.

- Staff are responsible for providing draft decisions to the experts and supervisors for review (for siting related and precedent setting submittals) in a timely manner so that deadlines can be met. Staff are responsible for tracking submittals and decisions on FIST within a week of the reception/issuance date.
- Regional Supervisors will maintain responsibility for assigning and overseeing all non-plan review work performed by staff from the 2 plan review Groups.

Position Descriptions

The Plan Review Implementation Workgroup strongly recommends that staff will remain at their existing work locations and report to their existing supervisor (with the elimination of the sub team supervisors, all regional staff will report to the regional team supervisor). This is in keeping with the “Waste Management Program Redesign Final Report” which specified that we “strive to minimize staff reassignment and dislocation”.

The current position descriptions for Regional engineers and hydrogeologists performing plan review are very similar. The Plan Review Implementation Workgroup reviewed these PDs and concluded that the goals and worker activities (tasks) in the current PDs would not change. However, we believe that the % of time spent on these activities may vary depending on whether the staff are in the active solid waste landfill group or the closed/non-landfill facility group.. The Workgroup has identified the following % time as a guide for each category, but recognizes that individual PDs may vary from the guideline numbers presented. Example PDs are attached.

<u>Engineer</u>	<u>Active Landfill</u>	<u>Closed/Non-LF</u>
Plan Review	60%	35%
Technical Asst.	10	20
Ben. Reuse	5	20
Expertise	10	10
Audit/Eval.	10	10
Coordination	5	5

<u>Hydrogeologist</u>	<u>Active Landfill</u>	<u>Closed/Non-LF</u>
Plan Review	45	20

Technical Asst.	10	20
Policy	5	15
Expertise	25	25
Site Eval.	5	15
Coordination	5	5
Contested Case	5	0

Stakeholder Input

The Plan Review Implementation Workgroup recommends that external and internal stakeholder input be sought in separate ways. For external stakeholder input, we recommend that drafts of the Implementation Plan be placed on our WEB site and an e-mail be sent to those stakeholders who participated in the redesign meetings notifying them that the drafts were available and their comments would be welcome. This approach is suggested because there was a sense that the external stakeholders had less interest in our internal workings, and more interest in the results (ie more efficient turnaround time on reviews, consistent application of our rules, etc.).

For internal stakeholder input, we recommend that meetings (2 locations, Madison and Wausau Area) be held in conjunction with the Program Structures and Operations Implementation Workgroup after the release of the 1st draft and before the release of the final draft. This will allow us to present our plans to interested staff at a point where they have something specific to react to, yet early enough in the process where change is easier. We would then incorporate stakeholder input into the second rough draft. This approach was suggested because we anticipate a great deal of staff interest in the implementation details.

APPENDICES

I. Timeline

PROPOSED TIMELINE/SCHEDULE FOR PLAN REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION WORKGROUP

3/31/05	Initial Meeting to Discuss Charges
4/1 – 4/6	Begin Drafting Report Based on Meeting Discussion
4/7	Distribute Initial drafts to WorkGroup
4/7 – 4/13	Receive Comments and Modify Drafts
4/14	Workgroup Meet to Work Out Differences – If Necessary
4/15	Submit 1st Draft to Redesign Team
4/18 – 4/29	Solicit Feedback From Redesign Team Discuss Reassignment Process with Personnel Hold Workgroup Meeting, If Necessary
5/2 – 5/13	Schedule and Hold Meeting with Internal Stakeholders Put 1st Draft on Waste WEB for External Stakeholders
5/16 – 5/20	Receive Feedback From Internal Stakeholders
5/23 – 5/27	Workgroup Meets to Discuss Changes Based on Comments
5/31	Incorporate Changes Into 2nd Draft
6/1	Submit 2nd Draft to Redesign Team
6/2 – 6/30	Reassignment Process (Note: Reassignment Process May Take Considerably Longer Depending On Process Used)
7/1	Implementation

II. Regional Engineer Position Description

REGIONAL WASTE MANAGEMENT ENGINEER

POSITION SUMMARY

A responsible technical position with a minimum of supervision for planning, coordination and implementing the engineering aspects of the Waste Management Program. The primary duties and responsibilities of the position are to conduct and coordinate evaluations of engineering design, construction and operation for existing and proposed recycling, solid waste and hazardous waste management and disposal facilities, of closure, long-term care and monitoring for operating and closed solid and hazardous waste facilities, and to determine adequacy with respect to site conditions, sound sanitary engineering design principles, and to state and/or federal standards and regulations; to evaluate the compatibility of the existing or proposed site design and construction techniques with the environment; to evaluate, inspect and document the performance of these systems for compliance with standards and regulations; to develop, revise and improve programs for recycling facilities, and landfill water and gas site controls; to provide technical assistance and guidance to the public on designing, constructing and operating waste management facilities and landfills; to provide expert testimony and support for enforcement actions; to encourage adoption and use of recycling methods at project planning and implementation stages; to coordinate activities with other Department programs and governmental agencies; to conduct evaluations of beneficial reuse projects for high-volume industrial wastes; and to provide technical assistance and engineering guidance to industries on the beneficial reuse of high-volume industrial wastes. This position involves project management responsibilities for project reviews and may involve supervision of limited term employees to prepare technical support information.

TIME %

GOALS AND WORKER ACTIVITIES

%

- A. Coordinate the engineering review and project management of Plans of Operations. Site Construction Documents, Closure Plans, Remedial Action Plans and Plan Modifications for existing and/or proposed or closed waste management and disposal facilities, hazardous waste TSD facility siting and exemptions for beneficial waste reuse. Review and write engineering related sections of Initial Site Report. Feasibility Reports, Infield Conditions Reports and Groundwater Standards Exceedance Reports. Serve as project coordinator for submittals that are primarily engineering reviews and retain responsibility for conducting reviews in accordance with statutory review times and procedures.
 - A1. Coordinate the engineering review with legal staff; program hydrogeologists, chemists, and other engineers; with other Department programs (i.e., wastewater treatment, water quality, air quality, water regulations and zoning), and other agencies where other approval or permits may be required such as DILHR, OSHA, EPA, DOT, PSC, FAA, DATCP.
 - A2. Analyze relevant field conditions, collected site data and review published data relevant to the submitted plans and reports; review the submitted proposed design, construction, operation, long-term care maintenance and remedial action details in terms of State Statutes, Administrative Code requirements, engineering standards, engineering principles and practices, environmental siting factors, public health, safety and welfare, feasibility requirements, administrative orders, EPA criteria, accuracy and other applicable federal and state requirements; and determine the adequacy and inadequacies of the submitted plans and reports.

- A3. Prepare reports in a format that will provide for documentation of all decisions which are subject to judicial review. This includes findings of facts, conclusions of law and special conditions of approval not covered by law or administrative codes. The special conditions have the force of law.
 - A4. Meet with applicants and consultants regarding conflicts over technical review and on the resolution of conflicts arising from the determination. Provide technical expertise to legal staff.
 - A5. Attend preconstruction meetings, and perform inspections during critical steps of facility construction. Properly document these events.
 - A6. Coordinate with waste management specialists and other staff to conduct site inspections and to collect specific data relevant to the review responsibilities.
 - A7. Prepare testimony, interrogatories, depositions, general correspondence, Governor's letters, Secretary's letters, letters for federal and state elected officials and mass media information on Department determinations.
 - A8. Represent the Department as an expert witness at public hearings, contested case hearings and in courts of law concerning the determination.
- %
- B. Coordinate the engineering review of plans and prepare responses for the beneficial reuse of high volume industrial wastes.
 - B1. Coordinate the review of plans, construction documentation and exemption request for the beneficial reuse of high volume industrial wastes.
 - B2. Analyze engineering and design data and analytical data in submitted plans and reports and when necessary direct their revision.
 - B3. Prepare the response/approval/denial to submitted plans and reports and, if necessary, impose conditions of approval.
- %
- C. Consult with and provide technical assistance to the public, consultants, other program staff or other governmental agencies.
 - C1. Provide information and technical assistance on program policies and procedures, Wisconsin Administrative Codes. State Statutes and related regulations including relevant federal EPA requirements.
 - C2. Discuss and evaluate design concepts, construction procedures, operation methods, closure requirements and long-term care needs.
 - C3. Prepare instructional or training materials.
 - C4. Provide design guidance and criteria in the areas of engineering design, construction, site operation, closure, long-term care, and remedial action for correcting environmental problems.
 - C5. Provide engineering assistance, recommendations and advise the hydrogeologist in the co-review of Initial Site Reports, Pre-Feasibility Reports, Feasibility Reports, and Site Investigations Reports.

- C6. Provide field inspection support to program hydrogeologists conducting geological surveys, groundwater investigations and groundwater quality sampling.
 - C7. Keep up to date on the latest technical developments by review of technical publications, inspection of new technologies and procedures, meeting with industry and attendance at formal training sessions.
- %
- D. Develop and maintain expertise in a specialized aspect of waste management engineering and serve as statewide expert for the purpose of providing technical assistance, serving on statewide teams as necessary, and recommending policy and guidance in the area of expertise.
 - D1. Apply and maintain professional knowledge of engineering principles. Maintain knowledge of state of the art/innovative technologies in the specified area of expertise.
 - D2. Serve as the statewide expert in the specified area of expertise, providing technical assistance to Department staff, engineering consultants and the public. Serve on statewide teams as necessary to provide expertise.
 - D3. Provide technical assistance and recommend policy and guidance related to the specified area of expertise.
- %
- E. Coordinate with other program staff to conduct Department audits, investigations, evaluations, and documentation of newly developed, existing or closed sites for compliance with and enforcement of environmental regulations, plan approval conditions, and court and administrative orders.
 - E1. Investigate failure of design, construction or operation; hazards to health, safety or welfare; nuisance conditions; and compliance with environmental regulations, approval conditions, and administrative measurements and tests.
 - E2. Evaluate data collected by the Department or by the regulated entity to determine compliance with program requirements and environmental adequacy of facility performance.
 - E3. Document for the case file and for enforcement purposes the findings of the inspection, investigation and evaluation.
 - E4. Report findings to the environmental enforcement program staff for appropriate action.
 - E5. Advise the permit holder of observations, test results, violations of regulations and/or orders, and suggest actions to improve design and achieve compliance.
 - E6. As necessary, prepare special plan approval conditions, recommend provisions contained in administrative or consent order stipulations, and/or court order stipulations to bring the facility in compliance with environmental standards and regulations.

5%

- F. Coordinate and cooperate with other Department programs and outside agencies.
 - F1. With Environmental Repair and Response activities.
 - F2. With the Bureau of Environmental Analysis and Review, including writing of environmental impact statements and providing expert testimony at environmental impact statements hearings.
 - F3. With the various wastewater programs, water supply, water regulation and zoning and water quality management programs.

III. Regional Hydrogeologist Position Description

REGIONAL WASTE MANAGEMENT HYDROGEOLOGIST - ADVANCED

Job Summary

Under the general supervision of the Regional Waste Team Supervisor, provide geologic and hydrogeologic expertise and oversight for solid and hazardous waste facility siting and performance in the region's Waste Management Program. Specifically, this involves implementation of the geologic and hydrogeological aspects of conducting inspections; plan review; project management of facility siting, construction, operation, and closure; and evaluation of facility performance and long-term care. The person in this position functions as part of a regional team of program staff responsible for ensuring that assigned facilities are sited, operated, and closed in a manner that protects human health and the environment.

The person in this position deals on a routine and continuous basis with highly sensitive and complex hydrogeological issues which involve a high level of interpretation, creativity, and independent judgment, and which have major impacts on department actions and future decisions. In addition, this position includes advanced responsibilities _____. The position also includes responsibilities as technical expert in the _____, and as technical expert in _____. Collectively, these specialized and advanced responsibilities comprise more than 51% of the duties of this position.

This position is part of the _____ Region Waste program, and the person in the position serves as a member of the _____ Regional Waste Team and other teams as assigned.

<u>Time %</u>	<u>Goals and Worker Activities</u>
---------------	------------------------------------

%	A. Coordinate the geologic and hydrogeologic review, interpretation and response to reports submitted for highly complex proposed, existing and closed waste management and disposal facilities, which may have a major impact on department actions and future decisions.
---	--

- A1. Coordinate the hydrogeological review with regional program team members for initial site inspections for proposed waste facility and soil borrow locations to determine compliance with applicable state and federal locational criteria and in preparing written opinions regarding the suitability of locations for development.
- A2. Review, using a high level of interpretation and creativity, siting reports for complex proposed waste disposal facilities to determine if they are complete, accurate and technically acceptable.
- A3. Using a high degree of independent judgement, require additional supporting technical evidence when necessary, and specify the acceptable methods of collection, testing and interpretation to be used to gather additional supporting technical evidence.
- A4. Identify geologic, hydrogeologic and design constraints to site feasibility in response to initial site reports and render initial site report opinions on the potential for complex proposed waste facilities to be feasible.
- A5. Coordinate the department's preparation of environmental assessments for complex and sensitive waste facility proposals across program/Division lines, prepare environmental assessments and environmental impact executive summaries or, when necessary, prepare the geologic and hydrogeologic sections of environmental impact statements.
- A6. Review feasibility reports for completeness and coordinate comments on completeness across program/Division lines.
- A7. Review and analyze baseline groundwater quality data, determine the need for exemptions to groundwater standards, and coordinate across program/Division lines the responses to exemptions.
- A8. Prepare Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Feasibility Determinations, and impose the necessary

conditions of approval in response to non-contested case feasibility reports.

- % B. Serve as the regional technical expert in _____
- % C. Act as the project manager for sensitive projects involving complex waste management facilities found to be contaminating the environment or threatening public health or welfare.
- C1. Evaluate exceedances of groundwater quality standards and the performance of complex active waste disposal facilities using advanced geologic, hydrogeologic, statistical, graphical, and chemical interpretation techniques.
- C2. When necessary, gather and analyze groundwater monitoring data to determine compliance with groundwater quality standards and to protect the public's health and welfare.
- C3. Respond to exceedances of groundwater quality standards and, when necessary, require additional groundwater monitoring and/or technical information to be submitted in a Site Investigation Report.
- C4. Review proposed workplans and determine if they are technically acceptable and sufficient to define the degree and extent of contamination.
- C5. When necessary, require additional supporting technical evidence and specify the acceptable methods of collection, testing and interpretation to be used to gather additional supporting technical evidence.

- C6. Prepare detailed technical descriptions of the degree and extent of environmental impacts, including any impacts on the public's health and welfare and, when necessary, require Remedial Action Options Reports.
 - C7. Review proposed remedial action options and require implementation of necessary remedial actions.
 - C8. Ensure that investigation and remediation activities for assigned projects are conducted under the appropriate authorities and meet all applicable requirements.
- %
- D. Consult with and provide technical assistance to the public, consultants, representatives of industry and other agencies, and internal agency staff.
 - D1. Provide information on regional hydrogeology, solid and hazardous waste management, the Waste Management Program and state and federal regulations.
 - D2. Recommend waste disposal site selection and geologic and hydrogeologic collection, testing, and interpretation methods for proposed and existing waste disposal site investigations.
 - D3. Discuss and evaluate design proposals for complex new waste disposal facilities and remedial action options for existing waste disposal facilities.

- D4. Provide technical justification for the state's waste facility locational and performance requirements, site investigation requirements, specifications, standards, and design criteria.
- D5. Keep up to date on the state-of-the-art technical developments in appropriate areas of geologic, hydrogeologic, geophysical investigation and interpretation methods and techniques by review of technical publications and attendance at formal training sessions and conferences.
- D6. Work with the Regional Waste Team in responding to complaints of improper waste handling or illegal dumping which may discharge contaminants to the environment.
- D7. Ensure that groundwater data from private wells near landfills is reported to DNR and well owners in accordance with established statewide and regional policy.

%

- E. Assist Central Office staff in training new staff, and contribute significantly in developing administrative rules, technical guidelines, criteria, policies and procedures related to geologic and hydrogeologic work activities through participation on teams and through writing of technical reports, papers and presentations.
 - E1. Help provide training and/or information to other staff on the waste management program's technical guidelines, criteria, policies and procedures.
 - E2. Help develop new technical guidelines, criteria, policies and procedures for solid and hazardous waste disposal site selection, design and construction aspects related to geologic and hydrogeologic investigations, facility performance and remedial action options.
 - E3. Help prepare new administrative and manual codes or revisions to existing administrative and manual codes.
 - E4. Prepare, or provide input into the preparation, development or revisions of, review and procedures checklists and other internal documents used by staff, and to teams assigned such duties.

- %
- F. Coordinate with other programs/Divisions, regions, and governmental agencies on waste management program actions and activities which affect other programs/Divisions or agencies.
- F1. Coordinate with Remediation and Redevelopment staff on waste management activities which affect or involve that Program.
- F2. Coordinate environmental impact work with all other affected Department programs/Divisions when writing the geologic and hydrogeologic sections in an Environmental Impact Statement.
- F3. Coordinate with the various water programs the review and evaluation of proposals which will affect those programs or require a recommendation or permit from those programs.
- F4. Cooperate with the U.S. EPA, FAA, USGS, WGNHS, GRCD, ASTSWMO, UW-Extension, DATCP and other state, national and international agencies in accordance with priorities established with the Team Supervisor.
- %
- G. Provide technical assistance in the form of expert testimony and document review in contested case hearings and other complex and sensitive judicial proceedings involving solid and hazardous waste disposal facilities, which may have a major impact on department actions and future decisions.
- G1. Recommend conditions of site feasibility and provide the lead expert testimony concerning site feasibility for waste disposal facilities in contested case hearings.
- G2. As the lead technical reviewer, defend Feasibility Determinations and conditions of feasibility before the public, consultants, industry representatives and in any follow-up judicial proceedings.
- G3. Provide geologic and hydrogeological expert testimony at Environmental Impact Statement hearings.
- G4. Defend the geologic and hydrogeologic conditions of approval or provisions of plan approval modifications before the public, consultants, industry representatives, and in judicial proceedings.

G5. Provide technical input to and expert geologic and hydrogeologic testimony for complex enforcement cases involving waste disposal facilities and coal ash disposal

IV. HW TSD Facilities

Region	Facility Name	Wi License Expiration	Comment
WC	Vulcan	09/30/2002	License expected to be issued in June, 2005
SE	S.C. Johnson	09/30/2004	Expected to be relicensed in summer of 2005
NO	Stresau	08/07/2006	
SE	Badger Disposal	12/16/2006	
WC	Us Filter/ Zimpro	12/30/2006	
SE	MWSI	07/06/2010	
SC	Hydrite	05/07/2012	
SE	Master Lock	06/26/2012	
SE	Univar USA Inc.	12/27/2012	
SC	Safety Kleen - Madison	04/09/2013	
WC	Safety Kleen - LaCrosse	04/10/2013	
NE	Safety Kleen - Kaukauna	04/15/2013	
SE	Safety Kleen - Waukesha	04/24/2013	
SE	GE-Electric	06/30/2013	
SE	ONYX	06/30/2013	
WC	WRR Environmental Services	10/22/2013	
SE	Brenntag	12/09/2013	
SE	Superior SS	02/06/2014	